



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,699	09/08/2000	Birgit Oppmann	DX01042X	3652

28008 7590 09/04/2003

DNAX RESEARCH, INC.  
LEGAL DEPARTMENT  
901 CALIFORNIA AVENUE  
PALO ALTO, CA 94304

EXAMINER

VANDERVEGT, FRANCOIS P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1644

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. 09/658,699	Applicant(s) OPPMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner F. Pierre VanderVegt	Art Unit 1644	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 16 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 51-58.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
 PHILLIP GAMBEL, PH.D  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER  
 TECH CENTER 1600  
 9/4/03

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph (New Matter) rejection made of record in the Final Office Action mailed 5/19/2003.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendment necessitates the reinstatement of the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph (Written Description) ground of rejection made of record in the Office Action mailed December. 4, 2003. Applicant points to page 5, lines 15-20 and page 41, lines 22-24 for support of the present amendment. It is acknowledged that the rejection was previously applied to claims reciting "but is not substantially immunologically reactive with any epitope presented by either IL-B30 alone or p40 alone" and the present claims recite "but not IL-B30 alone or p40 alone." However, the present absolute proviso fully fits within the metes and bounds of "substantially," as previously of issue. Contrary to Applicant's position, a mere directive to the artisan on how the claimed anti-p40/B30 antibody could be made and selected does not constitute adequate written descriptive support of the claimed antibody. As previously stated, there is no written description in the specification of a particular antibody which meets the limitation, nor is there a written description of epitopes which are expressed on a IL-B30/p40 fusion but not on B30 or p40 as an individual entity. Mere description of a fusion protein (specification page 43, first paragraph for example) and an invitation for the artisan to find antibodies which meet the claim limitation (page 41, lines 22-24 for example) do not constitute adequate written descriptive support for the claimed invention.